AW

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/715,164	11/20/2000	Takashi Touma	Q61753	6871

7590 12/19/2005

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER	
MOE, AUNG SOE	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2685	

DATE MAILED: 12/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/715,164	Applicant(s) TOUMA ET AL.	
	Examiner Aung S. Moe	Art Unit 2685	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) 12-15 is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 09/23/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1, 3-6 and 10, the Applicant alleged (in page 8 of the remarks), "Murayama '700 does not teach that the brightness of the LEDs is changed during exposure".

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees because Murayama '700 clearly state in col. 4, lines 65 – col. 5, line 10 that "it is possible to cope with a lightness change or a color tone change according to user's taste by the power control portion ***controlling the brightness of the light-emitting elements*** (LEDs). Since all the exposure conditions that require correction depending on changes in printing environment can be adjusted by ***dynamically changing the brightness of the light-emitting elements***, the time control portion only needs to control the exposure duration on the basis of gradation information." In view of this, Murayama '700 clearly teaches that the brightness of the LEDs is changed during exposure to control the exposure duration on the basis of the gradation information (i.e., see col. 12, lines 40-46).

In additions, Murayama '700 further teaches that the exposure control unit (20) and the CPU 25 are capable of determining the time lengths of the lighting (i.e., Exposure time) in accordance with tone levels (i.e., noted that the exposure time lengths of the lighting is determined based on the tonal level as shown in Figs. 10 and 11; see col. 5, lines 60-65, col. 17, lines 10+ and col. 18, lines 50+) that are represented by the image data (i.e., col. 5, lines 60+ and col. 17, lines 15+), and changing luminance of the respective light emitting elements according a predetermined characteristic curve (i.e., Figs. 8 and 11) as the determined lighting time (i.e.,

Exposure time) for each pixel elapses (i.e., as discussed in col. 4, line 63 - col. 5, lines 10+, the exposure conditions that require correction depending on changes in printing environment can be adjusted by ***dynamically changing the brightness of the light-emitting elements***; see col. 5, lines 1-10. In particular, the brightness of the respective light emitting elements is changed by dynamically controlling the value of current supplied to the LEDs 31 through the CPU 25 during the determined exposure time based on the predetermined characteristic curve of the gradation data; see col. 10, lines 1-30, col. 11, lines 10+ and col. 12, lines 40-46).

In view of the above, the Examiner asserts that the combination of Pham '960 and Murayama '700 does in fact teaches "changing luminance of the respective light elements according a predetermined characteristic curve as the determined lighting time for each pixel elapses" as set forth in claim 1.

Claims 3-6 and 10 are also rejected for at least the reasons as discussed above for claim 1.

Regarding claims 7-9, it is noted that claim 7 recites feature similar to those given above for claim 1, the Examiner asserts that claims 7-9 are not patentable for the same reasons as discussed for clam 1 above. In view of this, the Examiner maintains the previous rejections as follows:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claim 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pham et al. (U.S. 5,300,960) in view of Murayama et al. (U.S. 6,130,700).

Regarding claim 1, Pham '960 discloses a drive method for an optical printer (Figs. 1 and 2) that drives a plurality of light emitting elements to emit light in accordance with image data (i.e., noted that the LED array 20 drive in accordance with the image data; see col. 1, lines 20+ and col. 3, lines 1+), for recording pixels of different densities on a photosensitive recording medium (12) to form a grayscale image (i.e., col. 1, lines 55+, col. 2, lines 10+ and col. 4, lines 25+), the method comprising the steps of:

determining time lengths of lighting the individual light emitting elements in accordance with tonal levels (i.e., the gray levels) of pixels to print that are represented by the image data (i.e., noted from Fig. 3-9 that the control unit 31 is capable of determining time lengths of the LED array in accordance with the gray levels of pixels to print that are represented by the image data; col. 4, lines 30+, col. 5, lines 1+ and col. 6, lines 5+); and

changing luminance of the respective light emitting elements (i.e., the LED array 20) according a predetermined characteristic curve (i.e., noted the use of curves as shown in Figs. 4-9) (i.e., as shown in Figs. 3-9 and further discussed in col. 2, lines 14+ and col. 9, lines 10+ that the control unit 31 is capable of simultaneously changing the luminance of the respective LED elements with a respective predetermined characteristic curve as shown in Figs. 4-9).

However, it is noted that Pham '960 does not explicitly stated varying the brightness for the light emitting elements during the *determined* exposure time (i.e., changing luminance of the respective light emitting elements as the determined lighting/exposure time for each pixel elapses) as set forth in the present claimed invention.

However, the above-mention claimed limitations are well known in the art as evidenced by Murayama '700. In particular, Murayama '700 teaches the use of an exposure control unit (i.e., see Figs. 4 and 6, the elements 20 and 25; see col. 17, lines 10+) for *determining* time length of lighting the individual light emitting elements (i.e., LED1-LED4) in accordance with tonal level (i.e., noted the time length of lighting each of the LED1-LED4 is cyclically increased or decreased by different level based on the tonal level as shown in Figs. 10 and 11; see col. 18, lines 60+) and changing luminance of the respective light emitting elements (i.e., noted that light emitting elements LED1-LED4 are simultaneously strikes each dot; see col. 18, lines 35+) according a predetermined characteristic curve (i.e., Fig. 11) as the determined lighting time (i.e., the determined exposure time; noted that the exposure apparatus 20 and the CPU 25 is capable of determining the lighting/exposure time for the individual LED based on the gradations level of the pixels to print; see col. 5, lines 60+ and col. 11, lines 25+) for each pixel (i.e., each dot) elapses (i.e., In col. 4, lines 65-col. 5, lines 2; Murayama '700 clearly stated that "it is possible to

cope with a lightness change or a color tone change according to user's taste by ***the power control portion controlling the brightness of the light-emitting elements***; see col. 5, lines 1-10. In particular, the brightness of the respective light emitting elements is changed by dynamically controlling the value of current supplied to the LEDs 31 through the CPU 25 during the determined exposure time based on the predetermined characteristic curve of the gradation data; see col. 10, lines 1-30, col. 11, lines 10+ and col. 12, lines 40-46). In view of this, it would prevent uneven color development in a printed image and therefore prevents deterioration of image quality (i.e., see col. 19, lines 10-15).

In view of the above, having the system of Pham '960 and then given the well-established teaching of Murayama '700, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Pham '960 varying the brightness for the light emitting elements during the exposure time as taught by Murayama '700, since Murayama '700 stated in col. 19, lines 10+ such a modification would prevent uneven color development in a printed image and therefore prevents deterioration of image quality.

Regarding claim 3, the combination of Pham '960 and Murayama '700 discloses wherein the luminance of the light emitting elements (i.e., the LEDs of Pham '960 and Murayama '700) is changed with time at a constant rate (i.e., noted from Figs. 4, 6, 7, and 9, the exposure time generated by the luminance of the LED elements are changed with time at a constant rate; see col. 7, line 25-col. 8, lines 20+ of Pham '960; and noted form Fig. 11 of Murayama '700 also shows varying of luminance of LED1-LED4 with time at a constant rate) from a constant initial value for each pixel (i.e., noted the initial value is provide by the counter 30 for each pixel; see

col. 8, lines 15-50 of Pham '960; and noted from Figs. 6 and 10-11, the constant initial value is provided by the CPU 25 and memory 27; see col. 13, lines 15+), whereas a lighting time length (i.e., the exposure time length, such that pulse X, Y and Z, as shown in Fig. 3 of Pham '960; and noted the lighting time of LEDs as shown in Fig. 10; see col. 18, lines 45-68 of Murayama '700) for each tonal level (i.e., the gray level 1-15 of Pham '960 and the gradation level of Murayama '700 as shown in Fig. 11) is determined by the initial value (i.e., the initial count value provided by the counter 30 of Pham '960; and the value provided by the counters 55 form the elements 25 and 27 as shown in Figs. 4 and 6 of Murayama '700) and changing rate of the luminance of the light emitting elements (i.e., noted the rate of pulse changes as shown in Fig. 3 of Pham '960; and noted the changing rate corresponding to a gradation data respect to the exposure time as shown in Figs. 10 and 11 of Murayama '700) and coloring characteristics of the photosensitive recording medium (i.e., noted the color printing as discussed in col. 9, lines 60+ of Pham '960; and noted the sensitivity of the photosensitive sheets values as discussed in col. 6, lines 5+ and col. 13, lines 55+ of Murayama '700).

Regarding claim 4, the combination of Pham '960 and Murayama '700 discloses wherein the lighting time lengths of the individual light emitting elements are changed proportionally to the tonal levels of the pixels to print (i.e., noted from Fig. 8 that the gray levels is proportional to the lighting time lengths of the exposure time; see col. 6, lines 40+ of Pham '960; see Figs. 10-11 and col. 18, lines 5+ of Murayama '700), whereas the luminance of the light emitting elements are changed with time for recording each pixel according to a non-linear curve that is determined by the lighting time lengths for the individual tonal levels (i.e., noted from Figs. 4-7 and 9 that the luminance of the LED elements are changed with the exposure time for recording each pixel

based on the non-linear curve that is determined by the lighting time lengths for the individual tonal levels; see col. 5, lines 55+, col. 7, lines 6+ of Pham '960) and coloring characteristics of the photosensitive recording medium (i.e., noted the coloring characteristics as discussed in col. 9, lines 60+ of Pham '960).

Regarding claim 6, the combination of Pham '960 and Murayama '700 discloses wherein the light emitting elements (i.e., the LED array 20 of Pham '960) are driven a number N of times of a constant unit time (i.e., noted that the clock 19 provides a constant unit time; see col. 6, lines 49+ and Fig. 8 of Pham '960) for recording each pixel, the number N being '0' or an positive integer and varied depending upon the tonal level of the pixel to print (i.e., noted that the exposure times for gray level No. 1 is assigned a value "0" through "6"; see col. 6, lines 40+ of Pham '960), to control the lighting time lengths (i.e., noted the control steps for controlling the exposure time lengths as shown in Figs. 4-9 of Pham '960).

Regarding claim 10, the combination of Pham '960 and Murayama '700 discloses (in Fig. 9 of Pham '960 and Figs. 10-11 of Murayama '700) wherein the luminance (brightness) of the light emitting elements (LEDs) is varied (i.e., noted from Fig. 9, that the brightness level of the LEDs is varied by using the brightest of the LEDs "B" for recording a gray level No. 1 dot and using the weakest of the LEDs "W" for recording a gray level No. 15 as discussed in Pham '960; and also noted the varying of exposure as taught by Murayama '700; see col. 10, lines 5+) during an exposure time (i.e., noted the "EXPOSURE TIME" of 6-100 microsecond as discussed Pham '960; and also see col. 4, lines 55-68 of Murayama '700 for varying the brightness of the LEDs during the exposure time) for recording the pixels (i.e., see col. 8, lines 10-45 of Pham '960; and col. 5, lines 5+ of Murayama '700).

Regarding claim 5, the combination of Pham '960 and Murayama '700 discloses a printing head (i.e., Fig. 1, the element 10 of Pham '960; and printing head 15 as shown in Fig. 1 of Murayama '700) that has the plurality of light emitting elements (i.e., the LED array of Fig. 1 of Pham '960; and noted the LED array as shown in Figs. 1-4 & 6 of Murayama '700) aligned along a main scan direction (i.e., noted the LED array scan the recording medium 12 in the main scanning direction, e.g., across the medium 12, as shown in Fig. 1 of Pham '960; and noted the direction "X" as shown in Fig. 1 of Murayama '700), and the photosensitive recording material (i.e., the element 12 of Pham '960; and the element 1 of Murayama '700) relative to each other in a such scan direction (i.e., the direction shown by the arrow in Fig. 1 of Pham '960; and noted the Y direction as shown in Fig. 1 of Murayama '700) perpendicular to the main scan direction, for recording the image line by line (i.e., col. 3, lines 5-10 of Pham '960 of Pham '960; and noted from Fig. 1 of Murayama '700, the sub scanning direction "Y" is perpendicular to the main scan direction "X").

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pham '960 in view of Murayama '700 as discussed above and further in view of Masubuchi et al. (U.S. 6,262,757).

Regarding claim 2, the combination of Pham '960 and Murayama '700 discloses the luminance of the respective light emitting elements (i.e., noted the LED elements as shown in Figs. 1 and 2 of Pham '960; and Figs. 3-4, 6 and 10-11 of Murayama '700) is raised as the lighting time (i.e., the exposure time) for each pixel elapses (i.e., see Figs. 3-9; col. 7, lines 50+, col. 8, lines 5+ and col. 9, lines 30+ of Pham '960; and Figs. 10-11 of Murayama '700).

Further, it is noted that although Pham '960 shows the use of the photosensitive recording medium (12), Pham '960 does not explicitly state that the recording medium (12) is a self-developing type photo film unit as claimed.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are well known in the art as evidenced by Masubuchi '757. In particular, Masubuchi '757 teaches that it is conventionally well known to use a self-developing type photo film unit (i.e., col. 1, lines 25+) which producing photographs shortly after the photosensitive medium has been exposed so that the delay between image acquisition and viewing the print is reasonably shot.

In view of the above, having the system of Pham '960 and then given the well-established teaching of Masubuchi '757, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Pham '960 as taught by Masubuchi '757, and such a modification would obviously allow for immediate preview of an acquired image thereof.

5. Claims 7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pham '960 in view of Murayama et al. (U.S. 6,130,700)

Regarding claim 7, Pham '960 discloses an optical printer (Figs. 1 and 2) for printing a grayscale image on a photosensitive recording medium (12) based on image data (i.e., col. 3, lines 3+), the optical printer comprising:

a printing head (i.e., Figs. 1 and 2, the element's 10) having a plurality of light emitting elements (i.e., the LED array) arranged in a main scan direction (i.e., the elements 10 and 20 of

the LED array arranged in the main scan direction as shown in Fig. 1), for projections light beams towards the photosensitive recording medium (12);

a driving device for driving the light emitting elements (i.e., noted that the LED array are droved by the driver 23 as shown in Fig. 2; see col. 4, lines 15+) while controlling time lengths (i.e., noted the controlling time lengths as shown in Fig. 3) of driving the individual light emitting elements per each pixel in accordance with tonal levels of pixels to print that are represented by the image data (i.e., see figs. 3-9; col. 4, lines 25+, col. 5, lines 1+ and col. 8, lines 5+); and control device (i.e., 33) for controlling the light emitting elements (LED 20) according a predetermined characteristic curve (i.e., note the curves as shown in Figs. 4-9 respectively) as driving time for each pixel elapses (i.e., noted the exposure time for each dot as shown in Figs. 4-9).

Furthermore, it is noted that although Pham '960 discloses wherein the printing head is capable of scanning the photosensitive recording medium (12) in the main direction for recording each line of image on the photosensitive recording medium by using a predetermined characteristic curve as the deriving time for each pixel (i.e., each dot) elapses, Pham '960 does not explicitly show a control device for *changing luminance of the light emitting elements according a predetermined characteristics curve as the driving time for each pixel elapses*; and a device for *shifting the printing head (10) relative to the photosensitive recording medium in a sub scan direction* perpendicular to the main scan direction after each line of the image is recorded on the photosensitive recording medium.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are well known in the art as evidenced by Murayama '700. In particular, Murayama '700 teaches that it is conventionally

well known in the art to use a scanning device (Fig. 1) for *shifting the printing head (15) relative to the photosensitive recording medium (1) in a sub scan direction* perpendicular to the main scan direction (i.e., noted the scanning directions "X" and "Y" as shown in Fig. 1) after each line of the image is recorded on the photosensitive recording medium (3), and changing luminance of the light emitting elements according a predetermined characteristics curve (i.e., Fig. 11) as the driving time for each pixel elapses (i.e., In col. 4, lines 65-col. 5, lines 2; Murayama '700 clearly stated that "it is possible to cope with a lightness change or a color tone change according to user's taste by ***the power control portion controlling the brightness of the light-emitting elements***; see col. 5, lines 1-10. In particular, the brightness of the respective light emitting elements is changed by dynamically controlling the value of current supplied to the LEDs 31 through the CPU 25 during the determined exposure time based on the predetermined characteristic curve of the gradation data; see col. 10, lines 1-30, col. 11, lines 10+ and col. 12, lines 40-46) so that it would prevent uneven color development in a printed image and therefore prevents deterioration of image quality (i.e., see col. 19, lines 10-15).

In view of the above, having the system of Pham '960 and then given the well-established teaching of Murayama '700, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Pham '960 varying the brightness for the light emitting elements during the exposure time as taught by Murayama '700, since Murayama '700 stated in col. 19, lines 10+ such a modification would prevent uneven color development in a printed image and therefore prevents deterioration of image quality.

Regarding claim 11, the combination of Pham '960 and Murayama '700 discloses (in Fig. 9 of Pham '960 and Figs. 10-11 of Murayama '700) wherein the luminance (brightness) of the light emitting elements (LEDs) is varied (i.e., noted from Fig. 9, that the brightness level of the LEDs is varied by using the brightest of the LEDs "B" for recording a gray level No. 1 dot and using the weakest of the LEDs "W" for recording a gray level No. 15 as discussed in Pham '960; and also noted the varying of exposure as taught by Murayama '700; see col. 10, lines 5+) during an exposure time (i.e., noted the "EXPOSURE TIME" of 6-100 microsecond as discussed Pham '960; and also see col. 4, lines 55-68 of Murayama '700 for varying the brightness of the LEDs during the exposure time) for printing the pixels (i.e., see col. 8, lines 10-45 of Pham '960; and noted the printing multi-gradation images as discussed in Figs. 10 and 11 of Murayama '700).

6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pham '960 in view of Murayama '700 as discussed above and further in view of Nakatani (U.S. 6,373,514).

Regarding claim 8, the combination of Pham '960 and Murayama '700 discloses wherein luminance of the light emitting element (i.e., the LED elements 20a-20n) is variable depending upon drive voltage applied thereto (i.e., noted form Fig. 2 of Pham '960 that the light emitting of the LED is variable upon drive voltage applied thereto by adjusting the resistor; see col. 4, lines 40+; and see col. 4, lines 55+ and col. 10, lines 1-10 of Murayama '700), and the control device (31) controls the drive voltage (i.e., see col. 4, lines 25+ of Pham '960; and see col. 4, lines 55+ and col. 10, lines 1-10 of Murayama '700) according the predetermined characteristic curve (i.e.,

noted from Figs. 4-9 of Pham '960 that the drive voltage must be adjusted as the driving time for the exposure time changes; and noted the curve as shown in Fig. 11 of Murayama '700) as the driving time for each pixel elapses (i.e., see Figs. 4-9; col. 4, lines 25+, col. 7, lines 20+ and col. 8, lines 1+ of Pham '960; and col. 10, lines 2+ of Murayama '700).

Further, it is noted that Pham '960 does not explicitly state wherein the printing head is a fluorescent display panel that contains an array of the light emitting elements.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are well known in the art as evidenced by Nakatani '514. In particular, Nakatani '514 teaches that it is conventionally well known in the art to use the printing head (60) which is a fluorescent display panel that contains an array of the light emitting elements (Fig. 1, 3 and 6; col. 4, lines 55+) so that the light emission condition of each luminous element may be readily grasped with accuracy by controlling the drive voltage applied thereto by the control device (i.e., see Fig. 10; col. 3, lines 10+, col. 5, lines 20+ and col. 10, lines 40+).

In view of the above, having the system of Pham '960 and then given the well-established teaching of Nakatani '514, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Pham '960 as taught by Nakatani '514 so that the light emission condition of each luminous element may be readily grasped with accuracy as suggested by Nakatani '514 (i.e., see col. 3, lines 10+).

7. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pham '960 in view of Murayama '700 and Nakatani (U.S. 6,373,514) as discussed above and further in view of Masubuchi et al. (U.S. 6,262,757).

Regarding claim 9, although the combination of Pham '960, Murayama '700 and Nakatani '514 show the control device (i.e., Fig. 2, the element 31; and Fig. 10, the element 7) raises the drive voltage as the driving time for each pixel elapses (i.e., see Figs. 4-9 and col. 4, lines 35+, col. 8, lines 1+ of Pham '960; and col. 5, lines 20+, col. 10, lines 40+ of Nakatani '514; and see col. 4, lines 55+ and *col. 10, lines 1-10 of Murayama '700 for varying the drive voltage of the LEDs*), the combination of Pham '960, Murayama '700 and Nakatani '514 does not explicitly stated wherein the photosensitive recording medium is a self-developing type photo film unit.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are well known in the art as evidenced by Masubuchi '757. In particular, Masubuchi '757 teaches that it is conventionally well known to use a self-developing type photo film unit (i.e., col. 1, lines 25+) which producing photographs shortly after the photosensitive medium has been exposed so that the delay between image acquisition and viewing the print is reasonably shot.

In view of the above, having the system of Pham '960 and then given the well-established teaching of Masubuchi '757, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Pham '960 as taught by Masubuchi '757, and such a modification would obviously allow for immediate preview of an acquired image thereof.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 12-15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aung S. Moe whose telephone number is 571-272-7314. The examiner can normally be reached on Flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward F. Urban can be reached on 571-272-7899. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A. Le

Aung S. Moe
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2685

A. Moe
December 10, 2005